



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2014

Acoustic cues to identity and predator context in meerkat barks

Townsend, Simon ; Charlton, Benjamin ; Manser, Marta B

Abstract: Formants, the resonance frequencies of the vocal tract, are the key acoustic parameters underlying vowel identity in human speech. However, recent work on nonhuman animal communication systems has shown that formant variation provides potentially important information to receivers about static and dynamic attributes of callers. Meerkats, *Suricata suricatta*, produce broadband noisy bark vocalisations, lacking a clear fundamental frequency and harmonic structure, when they detect aerial or terrestrial predators. Here we investigated whether formants in meerkat barks have the potential to provide reliable information on caller identity and the predator context (aerial versus terrestrial predator) in which they are delivered. Acoustic analyses of naturally occurring barks and measurements of this species' vocal tract length were used to confirm that the six clear frequency bands below 15 kHz in meerkat barks represent formants. Discriminant function analyses subsequently demonstrated significant inter individual variation in the formant pattern of meerkat barks, suggesting that formants could be used by meerkats to identify conspecifics. In addition, mixed-effects models indicated that the frequency of the first formant was lower in barks produced in aerial versus terrestrial predation contexts. These results add to a growing body of literature on the potential function of formants in nonhuman animal vocal communication systems, and also imply that signalling external and referential information through such resonance frequencies, as in human language, might be more widespread in animals than previously thought.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2014.05.021>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-102628>

Journal Article

Accepted Version

Originally published at:

Townsend, Simon; Charlton, Benjamin; Manser, Marta B (2014). Acoustic cues to identity and predator context in meerkat barks. *Animal Behaviour*, 94:143-149.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2014.05.021>

Acoustic cues to identity and predator context in meerkat barks

ABSTRACT

Formants – the resonance frequencies of the vocal tract - are the key acoustic parameters underlying vowel identity in human speech. However, recent work on non-human animal communication systems has shown that formant variation provides potentially important information to receivers about static and dynamic attributes of callers. Meerkats (*Suricata suricatta*) produce broadband noisy bark vocalizations, lacking a clear fundamental frequency and harmonic structure, when they detect aerial or terrestrial predators. Here we investigated whether formants in meerkat barks have the potential to provide reliable information on caller identity and the predator context (aerial versus terrestrial predator) that they are delivered in. Acoustic analyses of naturally occurring barks and measurements of this species vocal tract length were used to confirm that the six clear frequency bands below 15 kHz in meerkat barks represent formants. Discriminant Function Analyses subsequently demonstrated significant inter-individual variation in the formant pattern of meerkat barks, suggesting that formants could be used by meerkats to identify conspecifics. In addition, Mixed-effects Models indicated that the frequency of the first formant was lower in barks produced in aerial versus terrestrial predation contexts. These data add to a growing body of literature on the potential function of formants in non-human animal vocal communication systems, and also imply that signaling external and referential information through such resonance frequencies, as in human language, might be more widespread in animals than previously thought.

25 Keywords: Formants, Barks, Meerkats, Individuality, Functional Reference

26

27

28

29 The information content of animal vocalisations has been at the forefront of empirical work
30 addressing the diversity and complexity of animal communication systems and the function of
31 specific vocal signals (Hauser 1996, Bradbury and Vehrencamp 2011). Early research
32 correlating phenotypic or behavioural context information with acoustic features of mammalian
33 calls focused primarily on variation in amplitude, duration and the vibration rate of the vocal
34 folds which determines the pitch or fundamental frequency of a vocalization (Lieberman et al.
35 1969, Titze 1994, see also Taylor and Reby 2010). Subsequent studies have attempted to
36 deconstruct the acoustically encoded information based on whether it is related to the source
37 (the larynx) or whether it is independently derived as the sound wave is shaped by the vocal
38 tract resonances (so called filter-related characteristics) (Briefer et al. 2010, Charlton et al. 2010,
39 see also Taylor and Reby 2010 for a review). As with any tube of air, the supralaryngeal vocal
40 tract has resonant modes that can generate vocal tract resonances, or formant frequencies, by
41 amplification or dampening of specific frequencies originating from the source (Fitch and
42 Hauser 1995, Fitch 1997, Riede and Zuberbuhler 2003). Utilising this well-established source-
43 filter framework, several mammal studies have now shown that formants are reliable cues to
44 the caller's body size (e.g. Fitch 2000, Fitch and Reby 2001, Charlton et al. 2012) because of a
45 close relationship between formant spacing, vocal tract length and overall body size. In addition,
46 because formant frequency values are also affected by the shape of the vocal tract, which will
47 vary between individuals, these spectral components of mammal vocalizations are often found
48 to be reliable cues to individual identity (Rendall 2003, Solstis et al. 2005, Reby et al. 2006,
49 Charlton et al. 2009, Charlton et al. 2012).

50

51 Research from human speech and primate vocal communication has demonstrated that the first
52 two formants can be modulated more readily than the upper formants (which are more affected
53 by vocal tract length) (Riede and Zuberbuhler 2003). For example, during human vowel and
54 Diana monkey (*Cercopithecus diana*) alarm call production articulatory movements in the
55 frontal oral cavity, specifically the tongue and lip positions, can result in dramatic shifts in the
56 first two formant frequencies (Peterson and Barney 1952, Story et al. 1996, Riede and
57 Zuberbuhler 2003). Such flexibility highlights the possibility that dynamic contextual
58 information, in addition to static cues to anatomical features (e.g. body size or identity), is
59 potentially encoded within the formant structure of animal vocalisations.

60

61 Cooperatively breeding meerkats (*Suricata suricatta*) possess a diverse and complex
62 communication system characterized by over 30 different vocalization types, including a range
63 of specific and general alarm calls, vocalizations used to maintain group cohesion (close calls,
64 lead calls), and mediate social interactions (aggression calls within food competition, grooming
65 calls (Manser 1998)). Such acoustic complexity is likely to have evolved due to their foraging
66 technique, where their visual system is directly compromised during food acquisition, their need
67 to coordinate activities and the habitat they occupy with open areas and a high predation risk
68 (Clutton-Brock et al. 1998). Thus, vocal communication is essential for meerkats to keep track of
69 changes in both their social and ecological environment (Manser 1999, Manser 2001, Townsend
70 et al. 2011, 2012b). Observational and experimental data have demonstrated that considerable
71 information is encoded within meerkat alarm and close-range contact calls, including referential
72 and urgency-based information (Manser 2001, Manser et al. 2001) as well as information on
73 predation probability and group membership (Townsend et al. 2010, Townsend et al. 2011).
74 Further research on meerkat terrestrial alarm calls and close-range vocalisations has also

75 shown that these call-types are individually distinctive (Schibler and Manser 2007, Townsend et
76 al. 2010). However, because individuality in these calls was quantified using temporal and
77 source-related acoustic parameters (e.g. duration and fundamental frequency variation), the
78 potential for formants in meerkat vocalisations to cue identity and external contextual events
79 remains unknown.

80

81 Meerkat bark vocalizations are short (e.g. 0.1s), rapidly produced, harsh or “noisy” calls (see
82 Figure 2 and Supplementary Files 1 and 2) that should be particularly good for revealing
83 formants because the sound source has a very broad frequency spectrum and no harmonics
84 (multiple integers of the fundamental frequency) that could potentially be confused with
85 formants (Fitch and Hauser 1995, Charlton et al. 2013). Bark-like vocalisations are produced in
86 a number of mammal species from sea lions (Charrier et al. 2011) and dogs (*Canis familiaris*)
87 (Yin and McCowan 2004) to chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) (Goodall 1986) and are commonly
88 associated with social disturbance (e.g. threats from conspecifics (Slocombe 2005, Charrier et al.
89 2011)) or heterospecific predators (Manser 2001, Slocombe 2005). There is some evidence to
90 suggest that, within species, barks are produced in subtly different behavioural contexts and
91 also differ in their spectral profiles (Yin and McCowan 2004) and potentially convey information
92 regarding these contextual changes. For example, dogs produce barks in disturbance and
93 isolation contexts and detailed acoustic and statistical analysis could demonstrate that these
94 barks, previously classed as similar, are in fact subtypes (Yin and McCowan 2004). Meerkats
95 produce barks when they are at a safe-sheltered location and have detected either a perched
96 aerial or a terrestrial predator (Manser 2001, Townsend et al. 2012b). As with other alarm calls
97 they likely function to inform foraging conspecifics of a potential threat, but given their relative
98 heightened amplitude it is possible that they also play a role in predator deterrence (Manser
99 1998, Manser 2001, Townsend et al. 2012b). Meerkats also produce barks outside of predation

100 contexts when isolated or lost from their home group (Manser 1998), but these barks are less
101 frequent compared to those elicited by predation events.

102

103 In the current study we first investigated whether meerkat barks have the potential to encode
104 information about the individual identity of callers. Since vocal tract morphology is likely to be
105 individually specific we predicted that the formant pattern of meerkat barks will vary
106 consistently according to the identity of the caller. Our second aim was to determine whether
107 barks produced in different predator alarm contexts consistently vary in their formant structure.
108 Following findings in non-human primates (Riede and Zuberbuhler 2003), we investigated
109 whether the less anatomically constrained first and second formants of barks varied in different
110 predator alarm contexts (aerial vs. terrestrial predators) and hence, have the potential to signal
111 referential information regarding the current external situation (Seyfarth et al. 1980, Manser
112 2013).

113

114 METHODS

115

116 *Study site and subjects*

117 Barks were recorded from a wild, but habituated population of meerkats at the Kalahari Meerkat
118 Project (KMP), Kuruman River Reserve (KRR) in South Africa. The study site is situated in the
119 southern Kalahari Desert, 30km west of Van Zylsrus, South Africa (26°58'S, 21°49'E) (Clutton-
120 Brock et al. 1998). Recordings were taken from 12 different groups of meerkats between 1995
121 and 2011 (longterm Kalahari Meerkat Project audio recordings). All meerkats were habituated
122 to close observation and handling, enabling detailed recordings of behavioural and acoustic
123 interactions. Additionally, all meerkats were dye-marked and had a microchip transponder for
124 individual identification. One individual in each group was fitted with a radio collar (Sirtrack®)

125 to track the group at any time of the day (Jordan et al. 2007). The study population has been
126 observed since 1993 and the life history of all individuals is known since birth. The study was
127 conducted under the permission of the ethical committee of Pretoria University and the
128 Northern Cape Conservation Service, South Africa (Permit number: EC011-10).

129

130

131

132 *Recording of meerkat barks*

133

134 Barks were recorded at a distance of between 1 and 2 m from the caller with a directional
135 Sennheiser microphone (ME66 with K6 power module and a MZW66 pro windscreen, frequency
136 response 20 kHz, 2.5 dB, Old Lyme, CO, U.S.A.) connected to a Sony digital audiotape recorder
137 DAT-TCD D100 (frequency response: 20 kHz, 1 dB, 16 bit, 44.1 kHz) or a Marantz PMD-660/670.
138 We uploaded the calls on to a PC notebook and digitized them with either a U24 waveterminal
139 USB audio interface (Ego-sys, Seoul, Korea) or transferred the calls directly from micro HD to a
140 laptop.

141

142 *Acoustic analysis*

143 We used automated programs in Praat 5.1.03 DSP package (www.praat.org, Boersma and
144 Weenink 2014) to perform the acoustic analysis. Before conducting the acoustic analysis
145 narrow-band spectrograms were used to inspect the overall spectral structure of each bark, so
146 that poor quality recordings with excessive background noise and/or unclear frequency
147 components could be excluded. A total of 138 barks were excluded based on these criteria,
148 leaving us with a total of 143 calls from 11 individuals (range calls/individual=10-25; N calls

149 produced in terrestrial predation events=24 (from 4 events contributed by 3 individuals), N
150 calls produced in aerial predation events=119 (from 7 events contributed by 9 individuals)).

151

152 Before we conducted the acoustic analysis it was crucial to establish an approximate vocal tract
153 length (VTL) for our study population at KMP, in order to make *a priori* predictions about the
154 number of formants to expect in a given frequency range. We obtained x-rays from 25 deceased
155 individuals kept frozen at -20 degrees on the reserve (13 males, 12 females) and measured the
156 supra-laryngeal vocal tract (from glottis to lips) using a flexible ruler placed against the
157 calibrated radiograph (see Figure 1). Individuals either died from natural causes or were
158 euthanized due to injury or infection over the last 15 years (Drewe 2009). The average VTL
159 measured in this way was 6.67 cm (range: 5.61-8.03cm, SD=0.65). Because meerkat barks are
160 delivered with an open mouth (Manser pers. obsv.) the vocal tract could then be modelled as a
161 6.67 cm linear tube open at one end (the mouth) and closed at the other (the glottis).

162

163 Using this “open-one-end” tube model, the expected position of the first formant can be
164 calculated using the following equation: $F1 = c/4 \cdot VTL$, in which c is the approximate speed of
165 sound in the mammalian vocal tract (350 m/s) (Titze 1994). This gives us a predicted $F1$ value
166 of = 1311.8 Hz. Formants $F2$ - $F6$ are then predicted to occur at 3935.5 Hz ($F2 = 3 \cdot F1$), 6559 Hz
167 ($F3 = 5 \cdot F1$), 9182.6 Hz ($F4 = 7 \cdot F1$), 11806.2 Hz ($F5 = 9 \cdot F1$), and 14429.8 Hz ($F6 = 11 \cdot F1$),
168 respectively. Initial inspection of spectrograms also confirmed that six frequency bands exist
169 below 15000 Hz that could represent formants (Figure 2). Accordingly, we set our automated
170 programs in Praat to track and measure six formants in the frequency range 0-15000 Hz. To
171 check if Praat was accurately tracking these frequency components we compared the outputs
172 with visual inspections of each call’s spectrogram and power spectrum (using cepstral
173 smoothing: 500 Hz). Once we had confirmed that Praat was accurately tracking formants, the

frequency values of the first six formants (F1-F6) were measured using Linear Predictive Coding and the following analysis parameters: time step: 0.01 seconds; window analysis: 0.03 seconds; maximum formant value: 15000 Hz; maximum number of formants: 6; pre-emphasis: 50 Hz.

It is worth noting that it can be difficult to measure formants in “noisy” calls such as meerkat barks because it is hard to differentiate between formants and harmonics of the fundamental frequency that could still remain in sections of deterministic chaos, so called “pseudo-formants” (Fitch, 2002). Nevertheless, because the formants we measured in meerkat barks were not harmonically related (Figure 2), and the number of formants we found in the frequency range 0-15 kHz corresponded to the number predicted using our “open-one-end” tube model, it seems unlikely that these frequency components could be harmonics of the fundamental frequency. Thus, they are very likely to represent supra-laryngeal resonances, or formants.

Statistical analysis

We used Discriminant Function Analysis (DFA) to determine the classification probabilities of barks to individuals. Discriminant function analysis identifies linear combinations of predictor variables (e.g. acoustic parameters F1-F6) that best characterize the differences between groups and combines the variables into one or more discriminant functions, depending on the number of groups to be classified (Mundry and Sommer 2007). This analysis method provides a classification procedure that assigns each call to its appropriate class (correct assignment) or to another class (incorrect assignment). For external validation, we used a leave-one-out cross-validation procedure and to estimate the overall significance of the classification with DFA, we used two-tailed binomial tests with a corrected level of chance corresponding to the number of categories discriminated between (Mundry and Sommer 2007). To investigate the effect of external context (aerial vs. terrestrial) on formant structure we performed Linear Mixed-effects

Models (LMMs). LMMs account for multiple contributions from the same individual by incorporating subject identity as a random factor in the model (Crawley 2002). To assess the significance of explanatory variables, we compared the full model (with fixed (e.g. external context) and random effects (e.g. subject)) with a reduced model comprising only the intercept and random effects (subject) using a likelihood ratio test (Faraway 2006). Because all individuals producing barks with a suitable acoustic structure for analysis within the terrestrial predator category were female, we also repeated the analysis but controlled for the sex of the caller by including this as an additional fixed explanatory variable in the model. We again used a likelihood ratio test to assess the significance of fixed effect (external context) by comparing a “full” model (with both fixed factors and random effects) against a reduced model containing only Sex (fixed factor) and random effects (e.g. subject). We also calculated 95% C.I.s to verify the reliability of our estimates. When C.I.s include zero, the null hypothesis (of no effect) cannot be rejected (Nakagawa and Cuthill 2007). Furthermore we compared AIC values of the full and reduced model as an additional assessment of external context influence on first and second formant frequencies. Lower AIC values indicate improved support for each model (Akaike 1974, Golabek et al. 2012) with terms considered to improve the fit only if they inflated the AIC value by more than two units (Burnham and Anderson 2004). All analyses were performed in SPSS version 19.0 (SPSS inc, Chicago) or R version 2.12 (R core development team, 2013). Alpha values were set at 0.05.

218

219 RESULTS

220

221 *Cues to identity*

222 A Discriminant Function Analysis (DFA) correctly classified 76.9% of barks to 11 individuals.
223 When applying a leave-one-out cross-validated DFA this value dropped to 67.1% (cross-

validated) of barks to individual callers (Wilk's $\lambda = 0.016$, Chi Square (60) = 552.4, $P < 0.000$). A two-tailed binomial test demonstrated that this cross-validated classification level was still significantly higher than expected by chance (Chance level: $1/11 = 9\%$, binomial test, $P < 0.001$). Inspection of the DFA structure matrix and the accompanying eigenvalues shows that the upper formants F3-F6 contributed most to the observed variation between individuals (Correlation coefficients for Function 1 all above 0.3 see Table 1).

230

231 *Cues to predator context*

232 Linear Mixed-effects Models (LMMs) demonstrated that predator type had a significant effect on
233 the mean frequency of the first formant (LMM; $N=143$, LR test: Chi Square = 9.879, $df=1$, $P = 0.002$,
234 see Figure 3 and 4, Table 2 for CI's and AIC values). This significant effect remained when
235 controlling for the sex of the caller (LMM; $N=143$, LR test: Chi Square = 11.6, $df=1$, $P < 0.001$).
236 Specifically, model estimates controlling for pseudoreplication show that barks produced in the
237 presence of a terrestrial predator had a higher F1 than those produced in aerial contexts (Figure
238 3 and 4). Predator context, however, did not influence the frequency of the second formant
239 (LMM; $N=143$, LR test: Chi Square = 2.28, $df=1$, $P = 0.137$, see Table 2 for CIs and AIC values) or
240 upper formants 3-6 (see Table 3).

241

242 DISCUSSION

243

244 Our results demonstrate that the formant structure of meerkat barks has the potential to
245 provide static cues to individual identity and dynamic cues to the current external context
246 experienced by the signaler, specifically whether an aerial or terrestrial predator is present.
247 These findings add to a growing body of literature on the potential function of formants in non-
248 human animal vocal communication systems (see Taylor and Reby 2010). Formants have been

shown to vary consistently according to caller identity in several other mammal species (Rendall 2003, Soltis et al. 2005), and we also found that the upper formants (F3-F6) of meerkat barks contributed the most to individual distinctiveness. This is in line with similar findings in other species such as African elephants (*Loxodonta Africanis*) (Soltis et al. 2005), koalas (*Phascolarctos cinereus*) (Charlton et al. 2012), red deer (*Cervus elaphus*) (Reby et al. 2006) and chacma baboons (*Papio ursinus*, Rendall 2003).

When comparing the influence of external predator context on formant structure we found that, even with a small sample size, the average frequency of the first formant, but not the second, varied significantly between aerial and terrestrial predator contexts. Specifically, statistical model predictions suggested barks produced in the presence of a terrestrial predator had, on average, a higher first formant frequency value than those produced in aerial contexts. Because the first formant alone (and not F2-6) varied between different predator contexts, size-related differences (which would shift the entire formant pattern up or down) are very unlikely to have generated these contextual differences in the acoustic structure of barks. Furthermore, we are confident that the frequency components we have measured in meerkat barks are formants because they were not harmonically related (i.e., they are not multiple integers), and the number of formants we found in the frequency range 0-15 kHz corresponded to the number predicted using our vocal tract model derived from 25 individuals.

In humans, articulation of the lower formants (F1, F2) is critical for vowel production and hence represents one of the primary anatomical mechanisms for meaning encoding in speech (Titze 1994, Fitch 2010). In comparison to humans, meerkat articulation is unlikely to be actively controlled, but more passively modulated by the underlying arousal state of the signaller. One mechanistic explanation for contextual based variation in F1 may be that aerial predators

274 eliciting barks are often perched at considerable distances (range >100 m to >1 km away). Barks
275 to terrestrial predators on the other hand are primarily produced when such predators are in
276 close proximity (range 20 to 200 m away) (Manser 2001) and hence terrestrial predators, in this
277 context, may be perceived by signallers as a more imminent danger. Such heightened arousal in
278 meerkats is often associated with posture changes in the head and neck (Manser, unpub. data),
279 which ultimately can have downstream effects on the shape of the oral cavity or lip positions
280 and subsequent modulation of the frequency of the first formant. Further detailed investigation
281 into variation in vocal anatomy between barks produced in different contexts will verify from a
282 proximate perspective how and why such acoustic differences arise.

283

284 Similar findings where potentially “external”, referential information has consistently varied
285 with average F1 or F2 frequency have been demonstrated in species more phylogenetically
286 proximate to humans, such as baboons (Rendall et al. 1999) and Diana monkeys (Riede and
287 Zuberbuhler 2003). Both in Diana monkeys and meerkats the frequency of the first formant
288 varies with regard to predator type, though the direction of change seems to differ between
289 species, as in Diana monkeys F1 decreases in the presence of terrestrial predators, whereas in
290 meerkats F1 increases. However, as in meerkats, this may still map onto urgency levels, given
291 that in arboreal monkeys aerial predators are often more threatening than terrestrial predators.
292 Irrespective of the directionality and the exact production mechanisms underlying F1
293 articulation, our findings represent the first evidence for similar externally induced variation in
294 formant structure in a non-primate mammal. Given the phylogenetic distance between humans
295 and meerkats (circa 50 million years, Eizirik et al. 2010) these data may shed important
296 additional light on the conservative nature of vocal production mechanisms. Specifically, our
297 results imply that signaling referential information through the articulation of lower formants,
298 which are less constrained by anatomy than upper formants, might be more widespread in

299 animals than previously thought. As formant articulation is common in human language (e.g.
300 during vowel production), this may represent an example of “deep homology” for the encoding
301 of meaning in vocalizations.

302

303 Whether meerkats can perceive relevant variation in identity and context-related formant
304 information remains to be tested. Previous research on the anti-predator behaviour of meerkats
305 has demonstrated different escape responses are employed based on whether predators are
306 aerially or terrestrially located (Manser 1998, 2001, Manser et al. 2001). Being able to
307 determine predator type from the formant structure of barks would provide meerkats with
308 important referential information that could be used to inform future foraging decisions based
309 on potential threat levels (i.e. to remain in a safe position or continue to forage). For example, in
310 the presence of a perched aerial predator, meerkats may be able to return to foraging more
311 quickly than when exposed to a potentially more imminent threat such as a terrestrial predator.
312 Barks may be one communicative medium through which such information can be acquired. If
313 the potential confounding effects of the urgency of the event (e.g. terrestrial predators are more
314 dangerous) can be excluded from the processing of calls, to our knowledge such discriminatory
315 abilities would represent some of the clearest evidence for referential signaling within a single
316 call type and thus shed important light on pervasiveness of referential communication in
317 animals (see Townsend and Manser 2013).

318

319 In terms of individual recognition, recent experimental work employing a novel violation of
320 expectation paradigm has demonstrated individual discrimination via meerkat social close call
321 vocalisations, which likely is important in coordinating spacing between certain conspecifics
322 (Townsend et al. 2012a, Reber et al. 2013). Regarding alarm calls, however, habituation-
323 discrimination playbacks have indicated the absence of individual recognition and this is likely

linked to the costs associated with not responding to alarm calls (Schibler and Manser 2007). Whilst bark vocalizations are indeed alarm calls, they are primarily given when meerkats gather together at a burrow or a bolt hole. Receivers may therefore be under less pressure to respond consistently when they are already sheltered and hence, in comparison to other alarm call types, barks may be more suitable to test for individual recognition. Given the highly cooperative nature of meerkat societies, the ability to recognize individuals using barks may facilitate behavioural coordination allowing group members to keep track of cooperative anti-predator contributions (Mulder and Langmoore 1993). Moreover, it may also be that the ability to discriminate individuals from their barks would confer fitness advantages, potentially in detecting less reliable signalers (Seyfarth and Cheney 1990). Previous experiments in primates and non-primate mammals has shown that the alarm calls of individuals experimentally manipulated to be unreliable (through habituation and exposure to new alarm calls from the same individual) are less evocative than the calls of reliable individuals (Seyfarth and Cheney 1990, Blumstein et al. 2004). This suggests that recognition of individuals from alarm calls may be beneficial by allowing receivers to respond flexibly and adaptively to alarm calls based on the past calling behaviour of signallers. The highly repetitive serial nature of bark production also provides an excellent opportunity for the employment of habituation discrimination experiments testing for recognition of identity and external predator-type cues, in addition to ruling out more parsimonious explanations such as urgency related effects in explaining behavioural responses to bark types. Furthermore to systematically disentangle the influence of the first formant for discrimination between terrestrial and aerial barks, manipulation of the first formant could be undertaken to “create” terrestrial barks from aerial barks (by synthetically raising F1). Such playback perception experiments are crucial if we are to fully understand the adaptive significance of formant variation in meerkat vocal communication.

349 To conclude, we have demonstrated that the formant pattern of meerkat anti-predator barks
350 systematically varies according to caller identity and external predator contexts, and hence can
351 potentially provide cues to receivers regarding both. Exactly whether such information is salient
352 to receivers still remains to be shown, but habituation/discrimination playback experiments
353 provide a rigorous opportunity to test this. These results support previous findings suggesting
354 additional dimensions of information may be encoded within the layers of the vocalization
355 modulated by the supra-laryngeal vocal tract and hence that parameters, other than source-
356 related features, should be investigated when attempting to understand the form and function of
357 mammalian vocalisations.

358

359 References

360 Akaike, H. 1974. New look at statistical-model identification. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic*
361 *Control AC, 19*, 716-723.

362

363 Blumstein, D.T., Verenye, L. & Daniel, J.C. 2004. Reliability and the adaptive utility of
364 discrimination among alarm callers. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, London B*, 27,1851-1857.

365

366 Boersma, P. & Weenink, D. 2014. Praat: doing phonetics by computer [Computer program].
367 Version 5.3.66.

368

369 Bradbury, J.W. & Vehrencamp, S.L. 2011. Principles of Animal Communication (2nd edition).
370 Sunderland MA: Sinauer Associates.

371

372 Briefer, E., Vannoni, E. & McElligott, A. G. 2010. Quality prevails over identity in the sexually
373 selected vocalisations of an ageing mammal. *BMC Biology*, 8, 35.

374

375 Burnham, K.P. & Anderson, D.R. 2004. Multimodel inference: understanding AIC and BIC in
376 model selection. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 33, 261-304.

377

378 Charlton, B.D., Zhihe, Z. & Snyder, R. J. 2009. The information content of giant panda, *Ailuropoda*
379 *melanoleuca*, bleats: acoustic cues to sex, age and size. *Animal Behaviour*, 78, 893-898.

380

381 Charlton, B. D., Zhihe, Z. & Snyder, R. J. 2010. Giant pandas perceive and attend to formant
382 frequency variation in male bleats. *Animal Behaviour*, 79, 1221-1227.

383

384 Charlton, B.D., Ellis, W. A. H., Brumm, J., Nilsson, K. & Fitch, W. T. 2012. Female koalas prefer
385 bellows in which lower formants indicate larger males. *Animal Behaviour*, 84, 1565-1571.
386

387 Charlton, B. D., Taylor, A. M. & Reby, D. 2013. Are men better than women at acoustic size
388 judgements? *Biology Letters*, 9, 20130270.
389

390 Charrier, I., Ahonen, H. & Harcourt, R.G. 2011. What makes an australian sea lion (*Neophoca*
391 *cinerea*) males bark threatening? *Journal of Comparative Psychology*, 125, 385-392.
392

393 Clutton-Brock, T.H., Gaynor, D., Kansky, R., MacColl, A.D.C., McIlrath, G., Chadwick, P., Brotherton,
394 P.N.M., O'Riain, J.M., Manser, M. & Skinner, J.D. 1998. Costs of cooperative behaviour in suricates
395 (*Suricata suricatta*). *Proceedings of the Royal Society, London B*, 265, 185-190.
396

397 Crawley, M.J. 2002. Statistical computing: an introduction to data analysis using S-Plus. Wiley,
398 Chichester.
399

400 Drewe, J.A. 2009. Social networks and infectious disease transmission: Epidemiology of
401 tuberculosis in wild meerkats. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge.
402

403 Eizirik, E., Murphy, W.J., Koepfli, K.P., Johnson, W.E., Dragoo, J.W., Wayne, R.K. & O'Brien, S.J. 2010.
404 Pattern and timing of diversification of the mammalian order Carnivora inferred from multiple
405 nuclear gene sequences. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 56, 49-63.
406

407 Faraway, J.J. 2006. Linear Models with R. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL
408

409 Fitch, W. T. 1997. Vocal tract length and formant frequency dispersion correlate with body size
 410 in rhesus macaques. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 102, 1213-1222.
 411

412 Fitch, W. T. 2000. Skull dimensions in relation to body size in nonhuman mammals: the causal
 413 bases for acoustic allometry. *Zoology*, 103, 40-58.
 414

415 Fitch, W. T. 2002. Primate vocal production and its implications for auditory research., in
 416 Primate Audition: Ethology and Neurobiology., edited by A. A. Ghazanfar (CRC press, Boca Raton,
 417 FL), 87-108.
 418

419 Fitch, W.T. 2010. The evolution of language. Cambridge University Press.
 420

421 Fitch, W. T. & Hauser, M. D. 1995. Vocal production in nonhuman-primates-acoustics, physiology,
 422 and functional constraints on honest advertisement. *American Journal of Primatology*, 37, 191-
 423 219.
 424

425 Fitch, W. T. & Reby, D. 2001. The descended larynx is not uniquely human. *Proceedings of the*
 426 *Royal Society, London B*, 268, 1669-1675.
 427

428 Golabek, K.A., Ridley, A.R. & Radford, A.N. 2012. Food availability affects strength of seasonal
 429 territorial behaviour in a cooperatively breeding bird. *Animal Behaviour*, 83, 613-619.
 430

431 Goodall, J. 1986. The Chimpanzees of Gombe: Patterns of Behaviour. Cambridge: Harvard
 432 University Press.
 433

434 Hauser, M. 1996. MIT Press; The evolution of communication Cambridge, MA.
 435
 436 Jordan, N.R., Cherry, M.I. & Manser, M.B. 2007. Latrine distribution and patterns of use by wild
 437 meerkats: implications for territory and mate defence. *Animal Behaviour*, 73, 613-622.
 438
 439 Lieberman, P., Klatt, D. H. & Wilson, W. H. 1969. Vocal tract limitations on the vowel repertoires
 440 of rhesus monkeys and other nonhuman primates. *Science*, 164, 1185-1187.
 441
 442 Manser, M.B. 1998. The evolution of auditory communication in suricates *Suricata suricatta*. PhD
 443 thesis, University of Cambridge.
 444
 445 Manser, M.B. 1999. Response of foraging group members to sentinel calls in suricates (*Suricata*
 446 *suricatta*). *Proceedings of the Royal Society, London B*, 266, 1013-1019.
 447
 448 Manser, M.B. 2001. The acoustic structure of suricates' alarm calls varies with predator type and
 449 the level of response urgency. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, London B*, 268, 2315-2324.
 450
 451 Manser, M.B., Bell, M.B. & Fletcher, L.B. 2001. The information that receivers extract from alarm
 452 calls in suricates. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, London B*, 268, 2485-2491.
 453
 454 Manser, M.B. 2013. Semantic communication in vervet monkeys and other animals.
 455 *Animal Behaviour*, 86, 491-496
 456
 457 Mulder, R. A. & Langmore, N. E. 1993. Dominant males punish helpers for temporary defection in
 458 superb fairy-wrens. *Animal Behaviour*, 45, 830-833.

459

460 Mundry, R. & Sommer, C. 2007. Discriminant function analysis with nonindependent data:
461 consequences and an alternative. *Animal Behaviour*, 74, 965-976.

462

463 Nakagawa, S. & Cuthill, I. C. 2007. Effect size, confidence interval and statistical significance: a
464 practical guide for biologists. *Biological Reviews*, 82, 591-605.

465

466 Peterson, G.E. & Barney, H.L. 1952. Control methods used in the study of vowels. *Journal of the*
467 *Acoustical Society of America*, 24, 175-184.

468

469 R Development Core Team. 2013. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
470 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <http://www.R-project.org>.

471

472 Reber, S.R., Townsend, S.W. & Manser, M.B. 2013. Social monitoring via close calls in meerkats.
473 *Proceedings of the Royal Society, London B*, 280, 1765.

474

475 Reby, D., Andre-Obrecht, R., Galinier, A., Farinas, J. & Cargnelutti, B. 2006. Cepstral coefficients
476 and hidden Markov models reveal idiosyncratic voice characteristics in red deer (*Cervus*
477 *elaphus*) stags. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 120, 4080-4089.

478

479 Rendall, D. 2003. Acoustic correlates of caller identity and affect intensity in the vowel-like grunt
480 vocalizations of baboons. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 113, 3390-3402.

481

482 Rendall, D., Seyfarth, R.M., Cheney, D.L. & Owren, M.J. 1999. The meaning and function of grunt
483 variants in baboons. *Animal Behaviour*, 57, 583-592.

484

485 Riede, T. & Zuberbuhler, K. 2003. The relationship between acoustic structure and semantic
486 information in Diana monkey alarm vocalizations. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*,
487 114, 1132–1142

488

489 Schibler, F. & Manser, M.B. 2007. The irrelevance of individual discrimination in meerkat alarm
490 calls. *Animal Behaviour*, 74, 1259-1268.

491

492 Seyfarth, R.M., Cheney, D.L. & Marler, P. 1980. Monkey responses to three different alarm calls:
493 Evidence for predator classification and semantic communication. *Science*, 210, 801-803.

494

495 Seyfarth, R.M. & Cheney, D.L. 1990. The assessment by vervet monkeys of their own and another
496 species' alarm calls. *Animal Behaviour*, 40, 754-764.

497

498 Slocombe, K. 2005. Vocal communication in chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). PhD thesis, St
499 Andrews University, UK.

500

501 Soltis, J., Leong, K. & Savage, A. 2005. African elephant vocal communication II: rumble variation
502 reflects the individual identity and emotional state of callers. *Animal Behaviour*, 70, 589-599.

503

504 Story, B. H., Titze, I. R. & Hoffman, E. A. 1996. Vocal tract area functions from magnetic resonance
505 imaging. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 100, 537–554.

506

507 Taylor, A. & Reby, D. 2010. The contribution of source-filter theory to mammal vocal
508 communication research. *Journal of Zoology*, 280, 221-236.

509

510 Titze, I. R. 1994. Principles of Voice Production. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

511

512 Townsend, S.W., Hollen, L.I. & Manser, M.B. 2010. Meerkat close calls encode group-specific
513 signatures, but receivers fail to discriminate. *Animal Behaviour*, 80, 133-138.

514

515 Townsend, S.W., Zottl, M. & Manser, M.B. 2011. All clear? Meerkats attend to contextual
516 information in close calls to coordinate vigilance. *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology*, 65,
517 1927-1934.

518

519 Townsend, S.W., Allen, C. & Manser, M.B. 2012a. A simple test for vocal individual recognition in
520 wild meerkats. *Biology Letters*, 8, 179-182.

521

522 Townsend, S.W., Rasmussen, M., Clutton-Brock, T. & Manser, M.B. 2012b. Flexible alarm calling
523 in meerkats: the role of the social environment and predation urgency. *Behavioural Ecology*, 23,
524 1360–1364.

525

526 Townsend, S.W. & Manser, M.B. 2013. Functionally referential communication in mammals: the
527 past, present and the future. *Ethology*, 118, 1-11.

528

529 Yin, S. & McCowan, B. 2004. Barking in domestic dogs: context specificity and individual
530 identification. *Animal Behaviour*, 68, 343–355.

531

532

533

Table 1: DFA structure matrix

Structure matrix derived from the DFA of meerkat barks (based on formants 1-6) from 11 different individuals highlighting pooled within-groups correlations between discriminating variables and the first three standardized canonical discriminant functions with eigenvalues >1, explaining 89.5% of the total variance. Correlation coefficients above 0.3 (bold) indicate those acoustic variables that explained a substantial proportion of the variance in bark structure between individuals within the first three Discriminant Functions.

Acoustic variable	Function		
	1	2	3
F1	-0.01062938	0.988680953	-0.012597248
F2	0.182879953	0.341162015	0.298996144
F3	0.507532407	0.063813126	-0.316882962
F4	0.565273305	-0.03782931	-0.146703095
F5	0.520212197	0.114201165	0.454673731
F6	0.734468659	-0.235538029	-0.039221699
Eigenvalues	4.546196204	1.507715706	1.227096647

545 **Table 2:** Lower formant differences between predator classes
546 Effect sizes, confidence intervals and change in AIC values for Likelihood ratio tests on F1 and F2
547 (when excluding explanatory variable, predator context, from the final Linear Mixed-effects
548 Model). Note that the C.I.s for F1 do not include zero and the delta AIC is greater than two units
549 verifying the significant effect detected for context on F1 frequency.

550
551

Acoustic			
variable	Effect size	CI's	Delta AIC
F1	253.82	120.22, 387.42	7.9
F2	161.31	-44.8, 367.42	0.3

552
553

554 **Table 3:** Upper formant differences between predator classes

555 Results of the LMMs investigating the effect of predatory context on remaining formant

556 frequencies 3-6. Chi square and p-values correspond to the likelihood ratio tests.

557	Acoustic variable	Chi Square	P value
558	F3	0.2	0.64
	F4	0.02	0.8
	F5	0.05	0.8
	F6	0.5	0.4

559 **Figure 1:** X-ray image of a meerkat illustrating the vocal tract length (A) and the position of the
560 larynx (B). VTL is estimated as 7.93cm.

561

562

563 **Figure 2:** The top three spectrograms (a) show barks from the same individual and illustrate the
564 very low degree of intra-individual variability in bark acoustic structure. The lower three
565 spectrograms (b) show barks from three different individuals and illustrate the inter-individual
566 variability in bark acoustic structure. Spectrogram settings: FFT method, window length: 0.05 s;
567 time steps: 250; frequency steps: 1000; Gaussian window shape; dynamic range: 45 dB.

568

569

Figure 3: The spectral acoustic structure of an aerial and terrestrial bark given by the same individual. The upper panel shows spectrograms of an aerial bark (a) and a terrestrial bark (b). Spectrogram settings: FFT method, window length: 0.05 s; time steps: 250; frequency steps: 1000; Gaussian window shape; dynamic range: 45 dB. The lower panel shows the corresponding 800 Hz cepstral smoothed LPC spectra from the aerial (c) and terrestrial (d) barks. The formants are labelled F1 and F2. The red dots on the spectrograms illustrate the formant tracking facility in Praat. Note that F1 is higher in the terrestrial bark.

577 **Figure 4:** Influence of external threat type on a) mean frequency of the first formant (Hz) and b)
578 mean frequency of second formant (Hz). Bars represent model predictions and 95% confidence
579 intervals.

580
581

582

583